Appln. No. 09/902, 733 Amdt. dated October 29, 2004 Reply to Office Action of July 29, 2004

## REMARKS

The Official Action of July 29, 2004, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 1-3, 5-14, 16-25 and 27-33, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 4, 15 and 26 have been canceled. Claims 1-3, 5-14, 16-25 and 27-33 remain in the application for consideration.

Claims 4-10, 15-21 and 26-32 were objected to for depending from rejected base claims, but were deemed to recite patentable subject matter. Applicant has therefore canceled claims 4, 15 and 26 and combined the limitations of these claims into independent claims 1, 12 and 23. Claims 5-8, 16-19 and 28-30 have been amended to depend from claims 1, 12 and 23 respectively.

Claims 1-3, 11-14, 22-25 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Koga et al. (U.S. Patent 5,717,794).

As noted above, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 12 and 23 in order to distinguish the present invention over the cited art by incorporating the added limitations of claims 4, 15 and 26 (now canceled). Therefore, amended claims 1, 12 and 23 are now believed to be patentable over the cited art. In

Appln. No. 09/902, 733 Amdt. dated October 29, 2004 Reply to Office Action of July 29, 2004

view of the patentability of these independent claims, dependent claims 2, 3, 5-11, 13, 14, 16-22, 24, 25 and 27-33 are believed to be patentable, as well.

Applicant believes the amendments and remarks presented hereinabove to be fully responsive to all of the objections and grounds of rejection raised by the Examiner. In view of these amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims in the present application are in order for allowance. Notice to this effect is hereby requested.

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197 Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528 G:\bn\c\colb\zlotnick2\pto\Amendment-A.doc

- 10 **-**